

**UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
TUCSON FIELD OFFICE**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

EA Number: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0007-EA
Arizona Wild Horse and Burro Holding and Training Program
Arizona Department of Corrections
BLM Office: Tucson Field Office

Intensity

I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from the use of the holding facility relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the CEQ. With regard to each:

1. ***Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.*** The EA considered both potential beneficial and adverse effects. None of the effects are beyond the range of effects analyzed in the Phoenix RMP
2. ***The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety.*** No aspect of the Proposed Action would have an adverse effect on public health and safety.
3. ***Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity of historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.*** There are no known historic or cultural resource sites that would be affected by the Proposed Action. There are no parks, prime farmlands, or wild and scenic rivers in the planning area. No Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) is within the planning area
4. ***The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.*** No unique or appreciable scientific controversy has been identified regarding the effects of the Proposed Action.
5. ***The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.*** The analysis has not shown that there would be any unique or unknown risks to the human environment not previously considered and analyzed in EISs to which this decision is tiered.
6. ***The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.*** This project neither establishes a precedent nor represents a decision

in principle about future actions. The Proposed Action is consistent with actions identified in BLM's guidance as to the protection of Wild Horses and Burros.

7. ***Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.*** The environmental analysis did not reveal any cumulative effects beyond those already analyzed in the EISs which accompanied the Phoenix RMP and BLM's AML policy and guidance.
8. ***The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources.*** There are no features within the planning area that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
9. ***The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.*** No species will be adversely affected. The area has been denuded of vegetation consequently no habitat will be affected.
10. ***Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.*** The Proposed Action does not threaten to violate any law. The Proposed Action is in compliance with the Phoenix RMP, which provides direction for the protection of the environment on public lands.

Finding of No Significant Impact:

I have reviewed the environmental assessment, # DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0007-EA relating to the Florence Arizona Wild Horse and Burro Holding and Training Program located on the following lands:

T. 4 S., R. 10 E., Section 31, S½SE¼, Gila and Salt River Meridian

for the Arizona Department of Corrections (ADOC), including the explanation and resolution of any potentially significant environmental impacts. I have determined that the proposed action with the mitigation measures listed below will not have any significant impacts on the human environment and that an EIS is not required. I have determined that the proposed action is in conformance with the Phoenix Resource Management Plan approved in Record of Decision dated December 1998.

Attachments: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0007-EA

/s/ Brian B. Bellew
Field Manager

05/02/2013
Date

DECISION RECORD

EA Number: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0007-EA

BLM Office: Tucson Field Office

Decision: It is my decision to select the proposed action which is to allow up to 750 animals to be held in the newly constructed facility at Florence, Arizona.

Alternatives Considered: The “No-Action” alternative was analyzed in the environmental assessment. The No-Action alternative was not selected because it would not meet the purpose and need for the project.

Rational for Decision: The proposed action is specifically provided for in the Phoenix RMP. The environmental assessment analyzed the potential impacts to the environment and the public should the application be amended. A FONSI has been signed; therefore there are no significant impacts to the environment that would require an environmental impact statement. By selecting the proposed action, the Tucson Field Office is implementing this portion of the Phoenix RMP.

Mitigation Measures:

1. ACI will install an above ground sprinkler system.
2. Any cultural and/or paleontological resources (historic or prehistoric site or object) discovered by the holder or any person working on the holder’s behalf, on public or federal land shall be immediately reported to the authorized officer. The holder shall suspend all operations in the immediate area of such discovery until written authorization to proceed is issued by the authorized officer. An evaluation of the discovery will be made by the authorized officer to determine the appropriate actions to prevent the loss of significant cultural or scientific values. The holder will be responsible for the cost of the evaluation, and any decision regarding the proper mitigation measures will be made by the authorized officer after consulting with the holder.
3. As required by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act regulations at 43 CFR 10.4(g), “If in connection with the project operations under this authorization, any human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects or objects of cultural patrimony as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101-601; 104 Stat. 3048; 25 U.S.C. 3001) are discovered, the ROW holder shall stop operations in the immediate area of the discovery, protect the remains and objects, and immediately notify the Authorized Officer of the discovery. The ROW holder shall continue to protect the immediate area of the discovery until notified by the Authorized Officer that operations may resume.”

4. ACI will follow BMP's as set in "Collection and Storage of Agricultural Animal Waste and Wastewater" which regulates current laws in conjunction with Arizona Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations.

Administrative Review Opportunities

This decision may be protested or appealed under the procedures outlined in BLM Handbook 8720-1 Chapter IV (8) and 43 CFR Part 4 and the enclosed Form 1842-1.

/s/Brian B. Bellew
Field Manager

05/03/2013
Date

Attachments:

Finding of No Significant Impact dated May 2, 2013

Environmental Assessment – DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0007-EA